UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/371,537	08/10/1999	HIROFUMI SUDA	35.C13723	9383

5514 7590 01/06/2006

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER	
VU, NGOC K	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2611	

DATE MAILED: 01/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/371,537	SUDA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ngoc K. Vu	2611	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 October 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *22-45* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *22-45* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/20/05 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 10/20/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Applicant argues that neither the Strandwitz reference nor the Davis reference disclose or suggest a decoding unit adapted to decode the first encoded video data received by the wireless communication unit to provide decoded video data, or that a wireless communication unit is unit is adapted to receive first encoded video data encoded by a first video encoding system and transmitted from a first apparatus in a wireless network. Examiner respectfully disagrees.

With respect to claim 22, Strandwitz teaches that the gateway 401 (or "communication apparatus") converts the received wireless protocol (i.e., video data captured by wireless camera device 100) into wired protocol (i.e., standard public network protocol or the standard PC interface protocol) to transfer transport protocol signaling between devices 100 and 410 (see figure 4 and col. 6, lines 48+). Strandwitz specifically discloses that the wireless camera device

is communicating over a wideband radio channel 400 to a gateway 410 (see col. 6, lines 48-50). From this view, it must be understood that the gateway 401 comprises a wireless communication unit (i.e., RX unit) adapted to receive encoded video data encoded by the wireless camera device 100 and transmitted from the wireless camera device 100.

Strandwitz does not specifically disclose decoding the received encoded video data to provide decoded video data and encoding the decoded video data into second encoded video data using a second video encoding system as recited in claim 22. Davis shows that an apparatus (206 or 208 – see figure 2) translates encoded video data from first format to second format. For example, the received encoded video data (i.e., format A) from terminal 202 is decoded by decoder 212 to provide decoded video data, and the decoded video data are input to encoder 214 to encode the decoded video data into an encoded video data (i.e., format B) to provide the encoded video data to terminal 204 via switch 210 (see figure 2; col. 3-4, lines 63-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Strandwitz by decoding the received encoded video data to provide decoded video data and encoding the decoded video data into second encoded video data using a second video encoding system as suggested by Davis in order to effectively transfer encoded video data between devices that are compatible with different encoding standards with less cost.

The arguments with respect to claims 25, 28, 31, 34 and 37 are similar to arguments with respect to claim 22. Accordingly, the responses to these claims are similar the responses to claim 22. Rejections are addressed below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 22-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strandwitz et al. (US 6,522,352 B1) in view of Davis (US 6,078,350 A).

Regarding **claim 22**, Strandwitz discloses a communication system (see figure 4) comprising:

a first apparatus in a wireless network (100 – figure 4);

a second apparatus in a wired network (410 – see figure 4); and

a communication apparatus (401) that is communicable to the first apparatus, and is communicable to the second apparatus (see figure 4),

wherein the communication apparatus (401 – figure 4) includes a wireless communication unit (within 401, i.e., RX unit), a decoding unit (within 401), an encoding unit (within 401), and a wired communication unit (within 401, i.e., TX unit),

wherein the wireless communication unit is adapted to receive first encoded video data encoded by a first video encoding system and transmitted from the first apparatus (gateway 401 comprises encoding/decoding module, real time video transport protocol, verified transport protocol and a communication controller and transceiver so that encoding/decoding algorithms and transport protocols are configured and optimized based on the multimedia data type and the user's selection. Furthermore, the gateway 401 converts the received wireless protocol (i.e., video data captured by wireless camera device 100) into wired protocol (i.e., standard public network protocol or the standard PC interface protocol) to transfer transport protocol signaling between devices 100 and 410 (see figure 4 and col. 6, lines 48-63). The wireless camera device is communicating over a wideband radio channel 400 to a gateway 410 (see col. 6, lines 48-50).

From this view, it must be understood that the gateway 401 comprises a wireless communication unit adapted to receive encoded video data encoded by the wireless camera device 100 and transmitted from the wireless camera device 100),

wherein the wireless communication unit (RX unit in gateway 401) is adapted to receive first encoded video data encoded by a first encoding system and transmitted from the first apparatus (device 401 comprises RX unit for receiving encoded video encoded by video encoding unit in wireless camera device and transmitted from the wireless camera device 100 as shown in figure 4 – see figure 4; col. 6, lines 48-63),

wherein the wired communication unit (TX unit in gateway 401) is adapted to transmit the video data (from the wireless camera device 100) to the second apparatus (computer 410 – see figure 4).

Strandwitz does not specifically disclose decoding the received encoded video data to provide decoded video data and encoding the decoded video data into second encoded video data using a second video encoding system. Davis shows that an apparatus (206 or 208 – see figure 2) translates encoded video data from first format to second format. For example, the received encoded video data (i.e., format A) from terminal 202 is decoded by decoder 212 to provide decoded video data, and the decoded video data are input to encoder 214 to encode the decoded video data into an encoded video data (i.e., format B) to provide the encoded video data to terminal 204 via switch 210 (see figure 2; col. 3-4, lines 63-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Strandwitz by decoding the received encoded video data to provide decoded video data and encoding the decoded video data into second encoded video data using a second video encoding system as suggested by Davis in order to effectively transfer encoded video data between devices that are compatible with different encoding standards with less cost.

Regarding **claim 23**, Strandwitz discloses that the first apparatus (100) is a video camera (see figure 4), and the second apparatus (410) is an apparatus adapted to record the second video data on a recording medium (it is noted that multi-media personal computer 410 can record video data on recording medium such as disc, hard-drive...etc – see figure 4; col. 6, lines 48-58).

Regarding **claim 24**, Strandwitz discloses that the first apparatus (100) is a video camera (see figure 4), and the second apparatus (410) is an apparatus adapted to display the second video data (it is noted that multi-media personal computer 410 adapted to display the video data on monitor 411 – see figure 4; col. 6, lines 48-58).

Regarding **claim 25**, the interpretation for this claim is similar to the interpretation for claim 22 above.

Regarding **claim 26**, the interpretation for this claim is similar to the interpretation for claim 23 above.

Regarding **claim 27**, the interpretation for this claim is similar to the interpretation for claim 24 above.

Claims **28-30** recite a communication method having the same limitations as recited in claims 25-27. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 25-27.

Regarding **claim 31**, Strandwitz discloses a communication system (see figure 4) comprising:

a first apparatus in a wireless network (404 – figure 4);

a second apparatus in a wired network (410 – see figure 4); and

a communication apparatus (401) that is communicable to the first apparatus, and is communicable to the second apparatus (see figure 4),

wherein the communication apparatus (401 – figure 4) includes a wireless communication unit (within 401, i.e., TX unit), a decoding unit (within 401), an encoding unit (within 401), and a wired communication unit (within 401, i.e., RX unit),

wherein the wired communication unit (i.e., RX unit) is adapted to receive second encoded video data encoded by a second video encoding system and transmitted from the second apparatus (gateway 401 comprises encoding/decoding module, real time video transport protocol, verified transport protocol and a communication controller and transceiver so that encoding/decoding algorithms and transport protocols are configured and optimized based on the multimedia data type and the user's selection. Furthermore, the gateway 401 converts the received wired protocol into wireless protocol to transfer transport protocol signaling between devices 100 and 410. It is noted that the gateway 401 is two-way communications apparatus as shown in figure 4. From this view, it must be understood that the gateway 401 comprises a wired communication unit adapted to receive encoded video data encoded transmitted from the PC 410 – see figure 4; col. 6, lines 48-66),

wherein the wireless communication unit (TX unit in apparatus 401) is adapted to transmit the video data (from PC 410) to the first apparatus (404 – see figure 4).

Strandwitz does not specifically disclose decoding the received encoded video data to provide decoded video data and encoding the decoded video data into first encoded video data using a first video encoding system. Davis shows that an apparatus (206 or 208 – see figure 2) translates encoded video data from first format to second format. For example, the received encoded video data (i.e., format A) from terminal 202 is decoded by decoder 212 to provide decoded video data, and the decoded video data are input to encoder 214 to encode the decoded video data into an encoded video data (i.e., format B) to provide the encoded video data to terminal 204 via switch 210 (see figure 2; col. 3-4, lines 63-44). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Strandwitz by decoding the received encoded video data to provide decoded video data and encoding the decoded video data into second encoded video data using a second video encoding system as suggested by Davis in order to effectively transfer encoded video data between devices that are compatible with different encoding standards with less cost.

Regarding claim **32**, Strandwitz discloses that the first apparatus (lap-top computer 404) is an apparatus adapted to record the first encoded video data on a recording medium (i.e., video tape, hard-drive, disc...etc - see figure 4), and the second apparatus (410) is an apparatus adapted to reproduce the second video data from a recording medium (it is noted that multi-media personal computer 410 can reproduce the video data from recording medium such as hard-drive, disc...etc – see figure 4; col. 6, lines 48-58).

Regarding **claim 33**, Strandwitz discloses that the first apparatus (lap-top computer 404) is an apparatus adapted to display the first encoded video data (see figure 4), and the second apparatus (410) is an apparatus adapted to reproduce the second encoded video data from a recording medium (it is noted that multi-media personal computer 410 can reproduce the video data from recording medium such as hard-drive, disc...etc – see figure 4; col. 6, lines 48-58).

Regarding **claim 34**, the interpretation for this claim is similar to the interpretation for claim 31 above.

Regarding **claim 35**, the interpretation for this claim is similar to the interpretation for claim 32 above.

Regarding **claim 36**, the interpretation for this claim is similar to the interpretation for claim 33 above.

Claims **37-39** recite a communication method having the same limitations as recited in claims 34-36. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 34-36.

Claims **40-45**, Strandwitz discloses that transmission of video data must be isochronous to prevent buffer over flow or underflow in the receiving end in the system as shown in figure 4 (see col. 8, lines 9-13).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ngoc K. Vu whose telephone number is 571-272-7306. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Grant can be reached on 571-272-7294. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ngoc K. Vu
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2611

January 3, 2006